

Remarks

In the Office action of September 26, 2007, item 1 alleged that the supplemental information disclosure statement filed December 23, 2003 failed to comply with 37 CFR § 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed. The allegation is in error because a copy of the sole cited reference was indeed enclosed with the submission. Applicants enclose herewith a copy of the stamped return postcard receipt in which the PTO acknowledges receiving the IDS with a copy of the reference. Inasmuch as the received reference apparently did not make it into the formal application file, or possibly was scanned in such a manner as to render illegible an otherwise legible copy, Applicants herein enclose a duplicate copy of the reference, as a courtesy to the Examiner. However, a second Supplemental IDS duplicating the same information as the proper first submission is unnecessary. Additional fees in this matter are not deemed to be required, as Applicants are not responsible for the PTO's internal mishandling of its papers.

The drawings were objected to because Figs. 1-4 should be labeled as prior art. Applicants submit corrected drawings herewith.

Claims 2, 7, and 11 were objected to because of certain informalities. Claim 2 is being incorporated into claim 1, but the suggested correction has been made at the corresponding location. The suggested corrections to claims 7 and 11 are made herein. Regarding the recited parts of the edge detector means and the output driver means set forth in claims 7 and 11, Applicants better clarify the relationship between these recited means (a) and (b) and their respective parts.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pilling et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,130,503). Claims 2-6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be otherwise allowable.

Applicants amend claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 2 is cancelled, as now being redundant. Claim 1 and its remaining dependent claims are deemed now to be in condition for allowance. Applicants further rewrite claim 6 into independent form including all of the limitations of the original base claim. Claim 6 is now deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Further, Applicants are adding new claims 17 - 22, each of which is novel over the cited Pilling reference. Specifically, independent claim 17 is novel over Pilling in that Pilling does not teach, *inter alia*,

[A]n edge detector means . . . having a level detector means for generating a first signal and a second signal by detecting a rising edge from a low logical level and a falling edge from a high logical level of the clock signal; and a first logic circuit configured to receive the first signal, an inverse of the second signal, and a third signal based upon the first and second signals to generate the pull-up control signal; a latch coupled to the edge detector and configured to produce the third signal; and an output driver coupled to the latch. (Applicants' claim 17. Emphasis added.)

Similarly, Applicants' independent claim 19 is also novel over Pilling. Pilling does not teach, *inter alia*, the elements of

[A]n edge detector . . . having: **a level detector** configured to generate a first signal and a second signal by detecting a rising edge from a low logical level and a falling edge from a high logical level of the clock signal; and **a first logic circuit** configured to receive the first signal, an inverse of the second signal, and a third signal based upon the first and second signals **to generate the pull-up control signal; a latch** coupled to the edge detector and **configured to produce the third signal;** and an output driver coupled to the latch. (Applicants' claim 20. Emphasis added.)

Pilling is entirely silent with regard to "a level detector . . . for generating [configured to generate] a first signal and a second signal . . . and a first logic circuit . . . to generate the pull-up control signal [and] a latch . . . configured to produce the third signal" as recited in Applicants' new claims 17 and 20.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach all elements of the claim. See Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, the reference must show the claimed invention "in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim" in order to anticipate the claimed invention. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

As with Applicants' other independent claims contained herein, Pilling fails to teach all elements of Applicants' new independent claims 17 and 20. Therefore, each of the new claims 17 and 20 is not anticipated and is thus novel. Moreover, since claims 18, 19, 21, and 22 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 17 and 20 respectively, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 7-16. Reconsideration is requested in light of the amendments made herein. Further, Applicants have shown new claims 17-22 are also in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.6(a)(4) on the date shown below.

Signed: Sally Azevedo

Typed Name: Sally Azevedo

Date: January 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Schneck

Thomas Schneck

Reg. No. 24,518

Schneck & Schneck

P.O. Box 2-E

San Jose, CA 95109-0005

(408) 297-9733